

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

19 March 2014

Version of attached file:

Published Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Wold, B. (2004) 'Reconsidering an aspect of the title Kyrios in light of sapiential 4Q416 2 iii.', *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche.*, 95 (3-4). pp. 149-160.

Further information on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/zntw.2004.95.3-4.149>

Publisher's copyright statement:

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Reconsidering an Aspect of the Title *Kyrios* in Light of Sapiential Fragment 4Q416 2 iii

by Benjamin G. Wold

(Trinity Hall, Pimlico, Durham DH1 4QW, UK)

1. *Martin Werner's Hypothesis*

Martin Werner in his seminal work *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* presents a case that in Judaism and early Christianity the terms 'lord' (κύριος) and 'lords' (κύριοι) were used at times as designations for angels and were especially significant for the "Kyriostitel als Messiasnamen." He writes:

"Die andere Ableitung aus der Entstehungsgeschichte des urchristlichen Kultus steht dem wahren Sachverhalt näher, übersieht jedoch, daß die kultische Anrufung des Christus als Kyrios nichts anderes ist als ein Sonderfall der allgemeinen Tatsache, daß Spätjudentum und Urchristentum die Engel als »Kyrioi« bezeichnen und anrufen."¹

Werner provides a number of reasons for his hypothesis that the terms κύριος and κύριοι should be considered titles for angels. However, shortly after Werner's work was published Wilhelm Michaelis responded and rejected² Werner's theories including his suggestions regarding the *Kyrios*-title. To this day, while the debate surrounding Angel Christology often refers to Werner³, his suggestions regarding the *Kyrios*-title rarely surface.⁴ While the debate surrounding the background and implications of the title *Kyrios* continue, among divergent Hellenistic, Aramaic and Hebrew hypotheses Werner's idea has not gained a following.

¹ M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, Tübingen 1941, 307.

² W. Michaelis, *Zur Engelchristologie im Urchristentum. Abbau der Konstruktion Martin Werners* (GBTh 1), Basel 1942.

³ For instance C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT II 94), Tübingen 1997, 213; writes, "Ever since Wilhelm Michaelis's vehement rejection of Werner's attempt to argue for a thoroughgoing angel-Christology in early Christianity, the use of angelic categories has been dismissed as inadequate because Jesus is seen to be above the angels and too human to be an angel".

⁴ See J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament Kyrios-Title in:* idem, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*, Chico 1979, 115–142; in his article a lengthy review of scholarship on this title is provided, however Werner's hypothesis is not mentioned once. See also F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*, London 1969, 73–89; and D.B. Capes, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology* (WUNT II 47), Tübingen 1992.

Werner's suggestions for understanding the *Kyrios*-title, especially reading 1 Corinthians 8,5 as a reference to angels, has never gained support.⁵ However, new evidence from the Qumran literature (4Q416 2 iii 15–18; cf. 4Q417 1 i 15–18) might rekindle his hypothesis that the term 'lords' (אֲדֹנִים) was indeed used more broadly within Judaism as an epithet for angelic beings. Before proceeding to this relatively little considered Qumran fragment let us briefly remind ourselves of Werner's case: (1) the term κύριος is not a transference of the Septuagint name for God to Christ since there is not one occurrence of the term used for God by Paul; (2) 4 Ezra uses the term κύριος for angels repeatedly and calls himself 'servant' as does Paul in relation to Christ; (3) the Christian apocalyptic works *Shepherd of Hermas*, *Ascension of Isaiah*, and *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* preserve a use of the term κύριος as an epithet for 'angels'; (4) Acts 10,3f. describe Cornelius addressing the angels as κύριε and in Acts 9,5 Paul addresses the heavenly appearance of Jesus as κύριε (cf. the use of the term κυριότης in Eph 1,21; Col 1,16; Jude 8; 2Pet 2,10) indicating that the term in the New Testament is used for a class of angels; (5) the term κύριοι in 1 Corinthians 8,5, where Paul speaks of 'many lords' and Christ as the one Lord, serves as a link between early Jewish and primitive Christian teaching about Christ and apocalyptic doctrine of angels; and (6) 1 Enoch 41,10 describes the anointed among the hosts of angels and the 'angels of lordship (κυριότητες)'.⁶

2. 4Q416 2 iii lines 15–18

4Q416 2 iii is a column that survives in a fragment with four partially extant columns (4Q416 2 I–iv) and is one of several manuscripts of the document *Instruction* (4Q415–418, 423; 1Q26).⁷ By way of a short introduction,

⁵ Interpreting the term 'lords' as 'angels' is almost never mentioned as a viable alternative in commentaries on 1Cor 8,5–6. Often the discussion of these verses centres upon the existence (or non-existence) of divinities, or demons, followed by a statement of monotheism; see for instance C.K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New York 1968; H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK 5), Göttingen 1969; J. Murphy-O'Connor, 1 Cor., VIII,6: Cosmology or Soteriology?, *RB* 85 (1978) 253–267; W.L. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (SBLDS 68), Chico 1985; G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIC), Grand Rapids 1987; P.D. Gardner, *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian: An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 8–11:1*, Lanham/New York/London 1994; C. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (ThHK 7), Berlin 1996; J.F.M. Smit, "About the Idol Offerings": Rhetoric, Social Context and Theology of Paul's Discourse in First Corinthians 8:1–11:1, Leuven 2000.

⁶ Werner, *Entstehung* (see n. 1), 308–312.

⁷ The transcription of the Hebrew text used here is that of J. Strugnell/D.J. Harrington/T. Elgvin, *DJD XXXIV: Sapiential Texts Part 2*, Oxford 1999; all translations are mine unless otherwise indicated.

Instruction may be said to be a document which interweaves both sapiential and apocalyptic elements. The first column of the document (4Q416 1) frames the composition within a cosmological context that alludes to the order of creation. Cosmological and anthropological concerns continue to be important motifs throughout the document. Gen 1–3 is both quoted (4Q416 2 iii 21 – iv 1), paraphrased (4Q423 1, 2 i) and alluded to throughout *Instruction*. 4Q416 2 iii lines 15–18 are lines that readily display this unique integration of sapiential and apocalyptic motifs. On the one hand a straightforward exhortation to honour father and mother occurs, common within Jewish wisdom traditions. On the other hand, an unusual analogy to parents is at play and origins⁸, fashioning and special revelation (i.e. רזי נהיה) are intertwined with an allusion to the fifth commandment of the Decalogue:

(15) תביט ואז תדע מה מר לאיש ומה מחוק לגבר כבוד אביכה ברישכה
(16) ואמכה במצעדיכה כי כאל לאיש כן אביהו וכאדנים לגבר כן אמו כי
(17) המה כור הוריכה וכאשר המשילמה בכה ויצר על הרוח כן עובדם וכאשר
(18) גלה אוונכה ברזי נהיה כבדם למען כבודכה ובן [הדר פניהמה

- 15) you shall gaze. Then you shall know what is bitter for a man and what is sweet for a man. Honour your father in your poverty,
- 16) and your mother in your *low estate* (lit. 'littleness'). For as God is to a man so is his own father and as אדנים are to a man so is his mother, for
- 17) they are the oven of your origin. As/when/while He has set them in authority over you and (He) *fashioned/formed* על the spirit so serve them. As/when/while
- 18) He uncovered your ear to the רזי נהיה, honour them for the sake of your own honour And *with* [] *venerate* their presence

Line 15 begins with an exhortation to pursue and gain knowledge, and compares the understanding of good and evil to sweet and bitter. In the following lines 15b–16 two unusual words occur. First is the term כאב (cf. 4Q415 2 ii line 1) which in the parallel fragment 4Q418 9a–9c appears as the variant כאל. Whichever term is read, כאב ('as the Father') or כאל ('as God'), the referent is undoubtedly God. The term that presents a challenge to translate is אדנים, rendered by Strugnell and Harrington as the singular 'Lord'. The editors suggest that אדנים functions as the *middah* ('מדה') of אל. Divine names are occasionally contrasted with one another (e.g. יהוה = grace/mercy and אלהים = judgement) by way of juxtaposition, which the editors suggest is one method known in rabbinic Judaism as the *middoth* (bPes 70b). In the context of 4Q416 2 iii line 16 the editors propose that these two divine names אל (= creator and sovereign) and אדנים (= merciful and loving) have been placed in contrast to one another.⁹ The difficulties of accepting this theory are: (1) כאב is not a divine name and כאל is not accepted as the better reading;

⁸ Origins is a dominant motif in *Instruction*, see for example 4Q415 2 ii 7–9; 4Q415 11 11; 4Q416 2 iii 9; 4Q417 2 i 11; and 4Q418 202.

⁹ DJD XXXIV, 121.

(2) **אֲדֹנִים** is not necessarily a divine name either; (3) this would be the only document I am aware of that contrasts **אֵל** with **אֲדֹנִים**; and (4) nothing in the context of 4Q416 2 iii suggests the attributes Strugnell and Harrington associate with the two titles.¹⁰

Column 4Q416 2 iii may be better understood against the backdrop of 4Q417 1 i lines 15–18. Here, following John Collins’ suggestion¹¹, the formation of humanity in *Instruction* appears to enter into a tradition from Gen 1,26–27 where the plural “us” refers to angels (**קְדוּשִׁים = אֱלֹהִים**) participating with God in creation. In 4Q416 2 iii lines 15b–16 an exhortation occurs to honour your father and mother. Immediately following, the conjunction **כִּי** introduces the simile that “as the Father is to a man so is his father and as **אֲדֹנִים** (‘lords’ literally) are to a man thus a mother”. It may be possible that these lines conceive of both God and angels (**אֲדֹנִים**) playing a role in the creation of humanity. This creative reality, or ontological fact within the document, serves as the basis upon which the exhortation to honour one’s parents is founded. That is, since both had a role in humanity’s creation they should both be honoured: mother and father along with heavenly counterparts, God and angels. 4Q416 2 iii lines 16 and following lines appear to maintain a purposeful ambiguity at points in regard to their referent, the creators or parents could be either earthly or heavenly.¹² Line 17 states that “they are the oven of your origin” which could, conceivably, refer to either pair. Similarly, the notion that “they have been placed in authority over you” could refer to either as well. The phrase “fashioned you according to their spirit, so serve them” in the latter half of line 17 is reminiscent of 4Q417 1 i lines 15–18 where humanity is fashioned according to the pattern of the holy ones. The idea of “serving them”, followed in line 18 by the statement “he exposed your ears to the **רִזְנָה**”, is also in keeping with the results of creation described in 4Q417 1 i, as well as a general veneration (**הִדָּר**; also “serve them” in line 17) of angels elsewhere in *Instruction* (4Q418 81).

¹⁰ “A man’s father represents **אֵל** (God *qua* Creator, Sovereign, and Judge, and his mother (*qua* merciful, loving, and gracious) represents **אֲדֹנִים**”; DJD XXXIV, 121.

¹¹ J.J. Collins, In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran, in: D.W. Perry/E. Ulrich (ed.), The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues, Leiden 1999, 609–618.

¹² Terminology and motifs in *Instruction* appear to be multivalent in places. Also, the influence of apocalyptic thought throughout the document may establish a purposeful ambiguity at points between imagery that could be read as either this-worldly or heavenly. Recognition of the occurrence of tensive-symbols and steno-symbols in *Instruction* may hold valuable insights and fresh perspectives on the theology of the document (e.g., poverty, inheritance, and origin).

3. *Dual Creators and Angelic Likeness in 4Q417 1 i lines 15–18*

Before exploring 4Q416 2 iii lines 15–18 in greater detail, a brief translation and summary of 4Q417 1 i lines 15–18 is in order. A number of scholars have suggested uniquely nuanced translations and interpretations of these lines, among them T. Elgvin¹³, A. Lange¹⁴, J. J. Collins¹⁵, most recently M. Goff¹⁶ and of course the editors of DJD 34. Below is my own suggestion for translating these lines:

- (15) כי חרות מחוקק לאל על כול ע [בני שות וספר זכרון כחוב לפניו
 (16) לשמרי דברו והוא חזון ההגוי לספר זכרון וינחילונו לאנוש עם יי רוח [כי]א
 (17) כתבנית קדושים יצרו ועוד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר כי לא ידע בין
 (18) [טן]ב לרע כמשפט [ר]וחן vacat ואחה בן מבין הבט vacat ברז נהיה ודע
- 15) because engraved is that which has been ordained by God against all the [iniquities] of the sons of perdition and a book of memorial is written before him
 16) for those who keep his words, and it is a vision of Hagu for a book of memorial. He gave it as an inheritance to humanity together with a spiritual people [becau]se
 17) according to the image of the holy ones is his (humanity's) formation, but no more does He give Hagu to a spirit of flesh because it knew not the difference between
 18) good and evil according to the judgement of his spirit vacat and you understanding one gaze on the רז נהיה and know ...

4Q417 1 i lines 15–18, in my opinion, depict the creation of all humanity in the image of the angels and all are recipients of special revelation (Hagu). Conversely, Collins suggests that this creative likeness is based upon a tradition of Gen 1–2 where a spiritual “Adam” is created in chapter one followed by an earthly or “fleshly” man in chapter two. This tradition, he points out, is preserved by Philo and he summarises:

“Philo understands the two Adams in his own philosophical framework. The Qumran Sapiential text understands them as two types of humanity, a spiritual people in the likeness of the Holy Ones and a ‘spirit of flesh’.”¹⁷

A few items must be resolved in order for Collins to read the creation of two distinct Adams, one that is in the likeness of angels (קדושים) and God while the other earthly. First, the term אנוש must be interpreted as the first man “Adam”, which Collins does based upon the use of the term אנוש for

¹³ T. Elgvin, *The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation*, in: T.L. Thompson/N.P. Lempche, *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*, Sheffield 1998, 139–147.

¹⁴ A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran (STDJ 18)*, Leiden 1995.

¹⁵ Collins, *In the Likeness* (see n. 11).

¹⁶ M.J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction (STDJ 50)*, Leiden 2003.

¹⁷ J.J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, Edinburgh 1997, 124–125.

“Adam” in 1QS 3,17–18.¹⁸ Here in the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* a clear allusion to Gen 1–2 occurs, but, contra Collins, the term אָנוּשׁ is an interpretation of the first man “Adam” as all “humanity”. Second, if “Adam” and the “people of spirit” were created in the likeness of the angels in Gen 1 and later the “spirit of flesh” is created in the earthly image of Gen 2, then one might consider the two creations to be mutually exclusive. Clearly then only a portion of humanity would share the formation in the likeness of angels. However, the phrase וְעוֹד לֹא poses a problem in this case. All but Harrington and Strugnell struggle or ignore the straightforward translation of וְעוֹד לֹא as “and/but no more”, which occurs at least seven times in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 17,5; Deut 18,16; 2Sam 7,10; Isa 47,8; Jer 23,4; Job 24,20; 1Chron 17,9) and is clearly used in the sense of ‘no more’ every time.¹⁹ Collins’ suggestion that Gen 1,26 is at play in 4Q417 1 i lines 15–18 is convincing, much less so is the division of humanity based upon two creations. Rather, I suggest that all humanity was created in the likeness of the angels as an interpretation of dual workers of creation from Gen 1,26: “let *us* make man in our image and our likeness”.²⁰

The distinction of the עַם רוּחַ with humanity generally is a distinction that could delineate between a present dualism that had not yet been distinguished when humanity was first created (cf. line 18 “according to the judgement of his spirit”). The designation of “fleshly spirit” falls to those who “knew not the difference between good and evil” and for whom revelation is *no longer* available. For this reason all humanity in *Instruction*, whether those of the “elect” or those who are among the “fleshly spirit”, are immortal.²¹ The creation of all humanity in the image of angels and bequeathing divine revelation to them was followed by a subsequent failure of a segment of humanity to know and adhere to a pursuit of wisdom. The result of which was the loss of revelation and a later designation as “spirit of flesh”. The concept of primordial possession and present ability to fail in understanding good and evil fits with the concept of the fatigable human pursuit of wisdom elsewhere in the document (4Q418 69 10–15). Further, an urgency exists in the document for the addressee to seek and attain wisdom, most often found in the revelation of

¹⁸ “He created man (אָנוּשׁ) to rule the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk until the moment of his visitation”.

¹⁹ The phrase וְעוֹד לֹא is translated variously as: “he had not before given” (Elgvin); “doch die Erklärung wurde nicht dem Geist des Fleisches gegeben” (Lange); and “moreover” (Goff).

²⁰ Similar exegetical traditions are also preserved in TgPsJon on Gen 1,26; bSanh 38b and BerR 1,26.

²¹ The immortality of all humanity in *Instruction* is argued by J.J. Collins, *The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon*, in: F.G. Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Traditions* (BETHL 168), Leuven 2003, 287–306.

the נהיה רז, with angels as a type of indefatigable model (4Q418 55 8–12).²² Exhortations to know good and evil, pursue knowledge and not go astray align themselves more closely to a dualism based upon behaviour and revelation rather than creation. Motifs and imagery from the creation of two men in Gen 1–2 in *Instruction* need then to be understood as reflecting something other than the creation of two peoples or what I would term a created dualism. The angelic fashioning of Gen 1 and earthly creation of Gen 2 may serve as categories to which portions of humanity relate, rather than to categories in which they were created. Even in regard to Collins’ appeal to Philo, other exegetical traditions of Gen 1,26 in which all humanity shares the likeness of angels are known by Philo and might be examined in his writings (Op. 72–76; Conf. 171–174; Fug. 65–70; Mut. 27–34).²³

4. The Identification of the Term אדנים

The suggestion that 4Q416 2 iii lines 15–21 base their wisdom upon conceptions from Gen 1,26 and angelic participation in creation is hindered by the identification of the term אדנים. What is clear is that parents are honoured because they played a role in creation just as אב and אדנים are an ultimate source of origination. Also clear is the general significance of Gen 1–3 in this fragment. Line 20 makes the statement that the addressee has taken a wife and progresses to address and exhort the addressee to “grasp her origins” (קח מולדינה).²⁴ The beginning of line 21 mentions once again the נהיה רז followed by an allusion to Gen 2,20–25 in the phrase that the wife taken is the “helpmeet of your flesh” (cf. 4Q418a 16b + 17) and then “according to the statute of God that a man should leave his father and mother” (4Q416 2 iv 1). The final lines of 4Q416 2 iii base wisdom for relating to one’s wife upon conceptions stemming from Gen 1–3 and the origin of woman. The significance of this later usage of creation serves to complement the suggestion that ultimate origins and creation (Gen 1,26) are envisaged in the preceding lines.

The use of the fifth commandment of the Decalogue in 4Q416 2 iii lines 15–18 is clear. In addition to an allusion to Ex 20,12 there may be an allusion to Mal 1,6 as well. It may be questioned whether the occurrence of the term אדנים in 4Q416 2 iii (and parallel MS 4Q418 9a–9c) alludes directly to any

²² This comes as little surprise as the superiority of the angels is something to which the community aspires in *Shirot ’Olat ha-Shabbat* (4Q400–407).

²³ The fashioning of a heavenly and perfect man (a “Urmensch”) in contrast to a later created earthly man are well known in Philo; see for example the works of T.H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (CBQMS 14), Washington D.C. 1983; D.T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, Leiden 1986, 242–251.

²⁴ Reconstruction and translation mine.

passage of the Hebrew Bible. If an allusion does occur here, it is possible that the author(s) had in mind Mal 1,6, which has several significant similarities with 4Q416 2 iii lines 15–16 that are readily apparent:

בן יִכְבֹּד אָב וְעֶבֶד אֲדֹנָיו וְאִם־אָב אֲנִי אֵיךְ כְּבוֹדִי
וְאִם־אֲדֹנִים אֲנִי אֵיךְ מוֹרָאִי אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לָכֶם

A son honours a father and a servant his master. If I am a father where is my honour?
And if I am lord(s) where is my respect? says the Lord of hosts to you.

Any conjecture that a link actually exists between 4Q416 2 iii and Malachi might be substantiated from a *targumic* source. The tradition of linking Ex 20,12 and Mal 1,6 is preserved in TgPsJon of Mal 1,6 and is further evidence that 4Q416 2 iii combines the two passages:

הָאֵל עַל בְּרָא אֲמִיר לִיקְרָא יְהוָה אָבָא וְעֶבְדָּא לְמַדְחַל מִן קֳדָם
אֲנָא אֵן דֹּאחֹן דְּחֵלִין מִן קֳדָמִי אָמַר יְיָ צְבָאוֹת רַבּוּנִיָּה
וְאִם כָּאֵב אֲנָא אֵן דֹּאחֹן מִקֳּדָמִי וְאִם כְּרַבּוֹן

Behold concerning the son it has been said that he is to show honour to the father, and the servant that he should show fear from before his lord and if I am like a father how are you showing respect before me? And if I am like a lord (sing.) how are you fearing from before me? Says the Lord of hosts.

The *targum* begins by referring to the fifth commandment of the Decalogue in the phrase “it has been said”, establishing a tradition of linking Ex 20,12 and Mal 1,6. For the most part the translation follows the Hebrew Bible closely only changing the plural **אֲדֹנִים** to the Aramaic singular **אֲתוֹן** (i.e. Hebrew **אֲדֹן**). The plural reading of “lords” is rather difficult and the change in the *targum* to the singular form of the word is not an unexpected correction. The non-explicit use of Ex 20,12 and Mal 1,6 in 4Q416 2 iii evidently chooses to preserve the difficult plural form (**אֲדֹנִים**) in alluding to the two passages. A purposeful preservation of the rare plural form may indicate the intent of the author(s) to denote more than simply the singular “lord”.

The term ‘lords’ occasionally occurs elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (5x), however, without the longer *holem waw* (**אֲדֹנִים**). For the most part the term occurs in a context that exalts the God of Israel (**אֲדֹנִי אֲדֹנִים**) over all other gods, (e.g. Deut 10,17; Isa 26,13; Ps 136,3). On two occasions the term might be better understood in the sense of earthly masters (1Kings 22,17; par. 2Chron 18,16; Isa 19,4).

The term **אֲדֹנִים** occurs only once in the Qumran literature, however it occurs a number of times in *Hekhalot* literature. Some of these occurrences may hold significant contributions for rendering the term in 4Q416 2 iii line 16. Due to the paucity with which the term **אֲדֹנִים** occurs in the literature of the period its use in these passages as a likely reference to angels is significant. First, *1QBook of Noah* (1Q19 2) line 5 uses the term **אֲדֹנִים** in a context that is concerned with proper names and designations for angels and reads:

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| קדש[י השמים] | (1) |
| לאמר גלו משפטנו לפני עליון | (2) |
| ולא תחתך] | (3) |
| מיכאל ואוריאל רפאל וגבריאל] | (4) |
| אדון[אדונים וגב[ור גבורים] | (5) |

- 1) [Holy One]s of hea[ven
- 2) [saying, reveal] our [ca]se before [the Most High
- 3) [] and not under you [
- 4) [Michael, Uriel, Rapha]el and Gabriel [
- 5) [Lord] of lords and Migh[ty One of mighty ones²⁵

If Barthélemy and Milik's reconstruction of *1QBook of Noah* is accurate, line 5 refers to God's dominion over angels. Though fragmentary, line 1 mentions the "holy ones of heaven", which is a clear reference to angels.²⁶ Line 4 expressly mentions the archangels by name, which establishes the context for the use of the term **אדונים** in line 5. The phrase **גבור גבורים** as a reference to angels may be established in the use of the term **גבורים** as an angelic epithet in *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* (4Q402 1 4, 4Q403 1 i 21). *1QBook of Noah* line 5 clearly uses the term **אדונים** as a designation for angelic beings.

Among the three occurrences of the term **אדונים** in *Hekhalot* literature two occurrences can clearly be demonstrated as containing angelic connotations. It may be rightly questioned how medieval manuscripts serve as a witness to a 1st century BCE document.²⁷ The use of Aramaic targums, rabbinic and more recently *Hekhalot* literature as witnesses for earlier compositions is notoriously difficult. In regard to the latter, Loren Stuckenbruck adeptly re-

²⁵ Hebrew text taken from DJD I; 1Q19bis is popularly identified as 1QBook of Noah but may be a fragment from 1 Enoch. Compare, for instance, 1 Enoch 41,10.

²⁶ In addition to the use of **קדושים** for "angels" in 4Q417 1 i, the term is broadly used in early Judaism for "angels" (e.g. 1QS 11,8; 1QM 10,12; 12,1; 18,2; 1QSb 1,5; 1 Enoch 1,9; 12,2; 14,23). See M.J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPS 11), Sheffield 1992, 328, 336–337.

²⁷ J.R. Davila concludes briefly on the origins of *Hekhalot* literature: "There is a greater degree of consensus about the authorship and life situation of the *Hekhalot* literature. It is generally agreed that the movement has its roots in Amoraic (and perhaps even Tannaitic) Palestine, but that important and perhaps crucial developments also occurred in Amoraic and Geonic Babylon, and that (apart from the [Cairo] Geniza fragments) the surviving *Hekhalot* texts have also undergone a lengthy period of transmission and redaction in the hands of European Jewish communities" (*Descenders to the Chariot: The People behind the Hekhalot Literature* [JSJS 70], Leiden 2001, 22). See also G.G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, New York 1954; M.D. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah* (TSAJ 28), Tübingen 1992; P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism*, Albany 1992; D.J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ 16), Tübingen 1988.

views the relationship between ‘*Merkavah* Mysticism’ and antecedents in Early Judaism, which would suggest their usefulness in interpreting earlier apocalyptic works.²⁸ Since *Instruction* is both a sapiential and apocalyptic work the structures and terminology between it and *Hekhalot* literature might be situated closely enough to be pertinent here. Observe the occurrence of **אֲדוֹנִים** in **א 34 588§** (N8128):

תפילה שנייה תתקדש יהוה אלהי ישראל שמים וארץ אדון אֲדוֹנִים אדיר אדירים
כרובים רוכב כרובים אל צבאות וממשלתי על צבאות אל משרתים

A second prayer, you shall be sanctified Lord God of Israel of heaven and earth, Lord of lords and Glorious One of glorious ones, cherubim riding cherubim, God of hosts and ruler over hosts, God of ministers.²⁹

Here the term occurs in a list of angelic epithets: glorious ones, cherubim, hosts and ministers. While the Hebrew Bible uses the term **מִשְׁרָתִים** to refer to the priests who serve in the temple (e.g. Ezek 44,11) the term is used both in post-biblical texts with angelic connotations (cf. 4Q286 3 2; 4Q287 2 9–12; 4Q400 1 i 4–7; 4Q405 23 i 3–6; 4Q511 35 4) and in *Hekhalot* literature (e.g. 3/א 63 V 67§; 2/א 34 N 588§). The use of the term **אֲדוֹנִים** in a list of angelic epithets establishes the second occurrence of the term as a designation for angels.

The second important occurrence of the term in *Hekhalot* literature is in 277§ **ב 13** (N8128). *Metatron*, the angel of Israel, is the subject of these lines:

Metatron whose name is called by eight names: Marguel is his name; Giutiel is his name; Ziutiel is his name; Izihiel is his name; Huiel is his name; Miuel is his name; Sagsagiel is his name; Magar(?)yadi(?) is his name. Within love, those that love him, in the heights calling him, in the camps Metatron, servants of the Lord, slow to anger, abundant in mercy, blessed are you Lord, wise of mysteries (**הַרְזִים**), Lord of Lords (**אֲדוֹנִים**) and the secrets (**הַסְתָּרִים**), amen, amen.

The majority of the occurrences (approx. 17) of the term **אֲדוֹנִים** in *Hekhalot* literature are in the construct “lord of lords” and usually set among similar constructs such as “king of kings” and “God of gods” (e.g. א 33 O1 253§; **ב 12** N 262§). In the pericope above, however, the preceding context describes aspects of the revered *Metatron* followed by the phrase “Lord of Lords” and thus would appear to use the term ‘Lords’ as an angelic epithet.

These three texts demonstrate that on the few occasions where the term **אֲדוֹנִים** occurs it is used as a reference for angelic beings. These sources demonstrate that the use of the term **אֲדוֹנִים** in 4Q416 2 iii line 16 to refer to angels is not only possible but likely. The combination of several factors from the con-

²⁸ L.T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology* (WUNT II 70), Tübingen 1995, 29–30.

²⁹ Hebrew text taken from P. Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 2), Tübingen 1981, 224.

text of *Instruction* lead to an even higher probability that 4Q416 2 iii line 16 uses the term **אֲדֹנִים** to refer to angels in the act of creation. First, 4Q417 1 i lines 15–18 most probably conceives of humanity being formed in the likeness of the holy ones. Second, 4Q416 2 iii line 17 states that both father and mother as well as God and lords are the “oven of your origin”, establishing a context and language not ordinarily associated strictly with earthly parentage. Third, the enigmatic phrase **וַיִּצַר עַל הָרוּחַ כֵּן עֹבְדֵם** (“and He fashioned by the spirit so serve them”) in 4Q416 2 iii line 17 is reminiscent of 4Q417 1 i line 17 and addresses formation beyond human parentage. Fourth, 4Q416 2 iii line 18 exhorts the addressee to “venerate their presence” which, in my estimation, is congruent with concepts of angel veneration elsewhere in the document (4Q418 81).³⁰

5. Conclusions

Werner’s hypothesis that ‘lords’ in 1 Cor 8,5 are ‘angels’ is strengthened by this discovery in *Instruction*. The current debate on Angel Christology may be significantly enhanced on account of this finding. Presently, a few observations may be offered specifically on reading 1 Corinthians from the perspective of 4Q416 2 iii lines 15–18. 1 Cor 8,5 speaks of “so-called gods (λεγόμενοι θεοί) in heaven or on earth” and then an aside occurs: “as in fact there are many gods (θεοὶ πολλοί) and many lords (κύριοι πολλοί)”. Paul may be reassuring the Corinthians that other powers do indeed exist and these are angelic figures: gods (**אֱלֹהִים**) and lords (**אֲדֹנִים**). If Paul is in fact influenced by such a tradition then “gods” may very well be synonymous with “lords” – both signifying ‘angels’. That is, both the terms **אֱלֹהִים** and **אֲדֹנִים** are used popularly for ‘angels’ in early Jewish literature (e.g. 4Q400 2 5; 4Q403 1 i 32; 405 46 2; 1QH 7.28, 10,8, 19,3; 1QM 1,10, 4Q181 1 4).³¹ 1 Cor 8,6 then might also preserve an interpretation of Gen 1,26 and play on both of these terms. For the Corinthian addressees, continues Paul, there is but one God (**אֱלֹהִים**) who is the father-creator and there is but one ‘lord’ (**אֲדֹנִי**), Jesus Christ, who is also a creator figure. It might be that Paul is adapting a broader interpretive

³⁰ Though a number of scholars have addressed 4Q418 81, C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the DSS* (STDJ 42), Leiden 2002, 178–179; is alone in forcefully rejecting this interpretation. See also A. Lange, *Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot*, in: D.K. Falk/F.G. Martínez/E.M. Schuller, *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies* Oslo, Leiden 1999, 40; T. Elgvin, *Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic*, in: *ibid.*, 15–38; E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*, Leiden 2002, 232–236.

³¹ In addition, LXX on Ps 97,7 and 138,1 translates the Hebrew term **אֱלֹהִים** with ἄγγελοι.

tradition of angelic participation in creation (Gen 1,26)³² in 1 Cor 8,5–6 that directly equates Jesus to an ‘angel’ and a fellow creator.³³ At the very least, the proposal that אַדְנִיִּים was used as an epithet for ‘angels’ in a 1st century BCE document should reawaken Werner’s hypothesis regarding κύριος, the Greek rendering of the Hebrew term, and invigorate the conversation that angelology and angel veneration in early Judaism is highly relevant for understanding early Christology.

³² Also of significance is that the LXX translation of Gen 2,18 (cf. Tob 8,6–7) formulates the creation of woman as coming from plural creators as well: “it is not good that man should be alone let us make a helper for him like himself”.

³³ J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, London 1980, 181; writes “the formulation in 1Cor. 8,6 is directed wholly to the situation of the Corinthians ... *it is hard to recognize an earlier formulation behind it*”. 1Cor 8,6 may be formulated upon an exegetical tradition derived from Gen 1,26–27 that conceived of Jesus, likened to angelic beings, participating with God in creation. H. Langkammer, *Christus mediator creationis* in VD 45 (1967) 201–208; discusses the role of Jesus Christ in relation to the ‘new’ creation based upon Ps 110 as interpreted in Acts 2,34–36.